

Committee on Performance-Based Compensation for Teachers

June 27, 2005

8:30am – 5:00pm

**JR Williams Building
W Conference Room
700 West State Street
Boise, ID**

Minutes DRAFT

Present: - Reed DeMordaunt, Jack Wenders, Byron Yankey, Wendy Horman, Karen McGee, John Goedde, Stan Olsen, Brenda Ballantyne, Parra Byron (afternoon), Cliff Green, Patty Toney, Ann Rydalch and Teresa Molitor. Absent – Colleen Thompson

Chairman Reed Demordaunt talked briefly about the process for the day and reviewed the package of material for the committee members. The day's goal for the committee: to finalize the criteria addressing the variable component.

Minutes of the May 20, 2005 meeting were approved as written.

General review of the variable component criteria

Reed asked the committee to consider the three general areas – building level, individual teacher level and professional development - from these we need to delve in to the specifics.

Committee discussed the position of the three elements: Achievement, Collaboration and Professional Responsibilities. There was also the question if all three should be included. The committee considered the elimination of all but the teacher achievement. Some suggested putting the Professional Responsibilities element under the base component.

The order of the elements was discussed. The committee agreed that they want to encourage collaboration but they want to minimize the 'free rider' effect. By putting the Collaborative piece first, it is possible for teachers who do nothing to 'ride' on the work of their coworkers. Wendy Horman suggested reversing step 1 and 2A to first recognize the individual teacher. An individual teacher must have at least 50% of their students meet their growth goal. That teacher is then eligible for a 'bonus' for student achievement and is also eligible to receive a bonus from the collaborative piece - if the collaborative criteria are met also.

Reed said that this committee would dialogue with the pilot districts to set the goals of the pilot and its implementation. The discussion continued in regard to what will be required of the districts.

The committee approved the motion to include only items 2A and Step 1 in the concept paper in that order. *Green, Horman - Motion to include only Step 1 and 2A - (Goedde – substitute motion to put them in order of 2A then 1) Green and Horman accepted the substitute motion.*

Section 2A – Achievement – Targeted Individual Student Academic Growth

Student academic growth needs to be measured by value-added. The committee discussed the fact that if three years of data is required this could be a long process. Reed suggested the districts could start populating the database immediately. There are past years of ISAT scores. ISAT would be only one of several items that a district can identify to find a student's academic growth history.

The motion to use a statistically valid and reliable value-added model where applicable was passed by the committee. *Green, Wenders*

Discussion continued regarding the threshold for the achievement piece.

Reed reminded the committee that we are looking at the variable component and not the base piece. We will not be affecting the present grid system at all. All the pilots at this point will be based on the variable piece and will address teacher recognition and compensation over and above the present salaries.

After much discussion, **the committee passed the motion to adopt the Wender's model that requires a teacher to have at least 50% of his/her students meet their academic growth target in order for that teacher to qualify for additional compensation. The allocation is to be set on an arithmetic progression.** *Green, Ballantyne*

Step 1 – Collaboration

It was noted that a collaborative team might be a school, a department, or a group of teachers - any collaborative effort that the administrator recognizes as a positive effort to effect student academic achievement.

Much of the discussion concentrated on the debate of the inclusion of management tools in the collaboration piece. Management tools such as parent survey, principal evaluation and grant writing were discussed. Pros and cons were weighed on the value of requiring a management piece in the collaboration component. It was decided that the management piece could be something determined by the pilot districts.

The committee voted that the collaboration component be measured on academic growth and that districts shall explore the feasibility of a management component that may be included in their pilot. *(First motion - that the collaboration component be measured on academic growth. Goedde, Yankey. Substitute motion added the management language– Molitor, Wenders)*

The committee discussed how collaboration could be recognized and rewarded. It was suggested that the districts would know better than the committee as to who are. Perhaps

the committee could give guidance by setting the threshold and the pilot district could identify the collaborative teams and who qualifies. This is an area where the districts can recognize the work done by their specialists.

The motion was passed to set the threshold at 50% when compensation for those teachers involved in a collaborative effort ‘kicks in’. The school districts will determine the collaborative groups. *Horman, Yanke*

It was also pointed out that a teacher is only eligible for the collaborative piece if s/he has met eligibility for the individual teacher piece.

Next meeting

It was decided that the committee should meet one more time before presenting its final concept paper to the State Board of Education for approval. Reed asked the committee members to consider the professional development piece some more.

The next meeting is set for August 2, 2005, starting at 9:00 am in the JR Williams Building, West Conference Room.

Reed asked that those committee members who had trouble receiving information talk to Allison to make sure their contact information is up to date.